

Docket No. F-7987

Ser. No. 10/673,780

REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are responsive to the Office Action of February 28, 2005. Reconsideration of the application and a notice of allowance are earnestly solicited.

The Examiner has objected to the specification for containing various informalities. Applicant has amended the specification to overcome the objections.

The drawings are objected to because the Examiner asserts that they do not show the coreless coil recited in Claim 5. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner because the specification illustrates in Figs. 3, 4 and 5 and discloses at page 3, lines 16 - 18, reference numeral 9 which is designated as the coreless waveform continuation coil. Figs. 6 - 8, and 10 - 17 also illustrate element numeral 9 and the specification discloses that the coil shown in Figs. 12 - 14 and 16 is a coreless waveform continuation coil. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the Examiner is incorrect no amendment to the drawings is required.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph because the Examiner asserts that the wording of the claim appears contradictory with regard to stating both that the rotor surrounds the coil and the coil surrounds the rotor. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner because the claim

Docket No. F-7987

Ser. No. 10/673,780

recites that the rotor surrounds the coil and the coil surrounds the sleeve.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the rejection is improper.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ackermann et al (U.S. Patent 5,714,828). Claim 1 has been rejected under section 102 (b) as being anticipated by Asada et al (Japanese Patent No. JP 01288611). Claim 2 has been rejected under section 102 (b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al (U.S. Patent 5,289,067). Claim 3 has been rejected under section 102 (b) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Patent 6,071,014). Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ackermann as modified by Sung (U.S. Patent 6,618,214) where Sung is cited for teaching a color wheel.

Regarding Claim 1, Applicant has amended the claim to recite that the bearing includes a hub disposed against the top portion of the rotor. This is inapposite with Ackerman which teaches that the hub 6 is spaced from the top portion of the rotor (see Figures 1a and 1b). As to Asada, amended Claim 1 differs from this reference as well because, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Asada teaches that the sleeve 3 is disposed against the top portion of the rotor 5.

Regarding Claim 2, Applicant has amended the claim to recite that the bearing coil is disposed axially collinear with the sleeve. This is inapposite with Tanaka which teaches that the coil is disposed axially perpendicular to the sleeve

Docket No. F-7987

Ser. No. 10/673,780

(see Figures 2 - 4).

Regarding Claim 3, Applicant has amended the claim to more clearly recite that a gas volume is between the shaft and the sleeve. This is inapposite with Figure 10 of Lee which is disclosed on column 7, lines 46 - 60, which teaches that the air journal bearing (i.e., the gas volume) is between an inner surface of the hub sleeve 162f and an outer surface of the stationary sleeve 166f.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 4 under section 103, although Sung discloses a color wheel *per se*, Sung by itself is an inapposite reference for combination with Ackermann in that there is nothing in Sung that would cause a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine such a color wheel with a motor with an aerodynamic bearing according to the present application to provide a color wheel for use in a copy machine or printer.

Applicant has provided new claims 6 - 18 which recite limitations of embodiments 1 - 9 as set forth in the specification at pages 4 - 6.

Docket No. F-7987

Ser. No. 10/673,780

Ten further independent claims in excess of three are added. The fee of \$2000.00 for the claims is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.


If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Docket No. F-7987


Ser. No. 10/673,780

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By 
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

and,

By 
T. David Bomzer
Reg. No. 48,770

Attorney for Applicants
Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340